[24th January 1933

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 25 OF 1932)—HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to communicate to the House a Message from His Excellency the Governor which runs as follows :—

> ' *On an examination of the Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act,* 1920 (*Bill No.* 25 *of* 1932) *as passed by the Legislative Council at its meeting held on the* 1st *November* 1932 *and of the provisions of the Act, I find that a consequential amendment to Section* 49 *of the Act should be made in order to make the new provisions fully workable. I accordingly return the Bill to the Legislative Council under Section* 81-*A* (1) *of the Government of India Act, for its reconsideration. Some drafting amendments also appear to me to be necessary in the Bill. Opportunity may be taken to make such amendments.*' "

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 26 OF 1932).

Clause 6.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, the House was good enough to give me permission yesterday to take up this Bill early this day and in the evening of yesterday the respective representatives of the various parties met together and, I am glad to say, came to some satisfactory conclusion. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar said that this was a non-party measure. I differ from him and say that this is an all party measure, because representatives of all sections of the House took part in it in a very hearty and sympathetic manner. And I am thankful to say that their labours have not been wasted and are likely to prove beneficial. If I am allowed to anticipate a little, I shall briefly refer to the agreed arrangements of yesterday evening. It was urged that this Bill is possibly a penal measure meant for application to the unsatisfactory municipalities. But there was never any such idea. It is really to enable the municipal bodies to conduct their administration with increasing satisfaction that this Bill has been brought forward. There is no intention whatsoever to attach any stigma to any municipality.

" One question raised at the meeting was whether the number of municipalities included in the Schedule is not too large. We had fixed the income test as two lakhs of rupees and included all municipalities having an income over that figure. It was urged that in consideration of the resources of certain municipalities and other causes, it may not be possible to start straightaway appointing Commissioners for all the 26 municipalities included in the Schedule. Now we have reduced the number to 10 by raising the limit of the income to 3 lakhs of rupees instead of two lakhs. Some members on the opposite side have given notice of motions to reduce the number to 12 or 14 but we thought that a more satisfactory solution for all their objections was to raise the limit of income to 3 lakhs of rupees.

" It was urged that the chairmen of municipalities were ignored altogether in the matter of giving contracts. We have taken their